

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:)	Group Art Unit: 2812
Shunpei YAMAZAKI et al.)	Examiner: A. Ghyka
Serial No. 09/362,192)	CERTIFICATE OF MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on 1-1-04
Filed: July 28, 1999)	
For: SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE HAVING)	
SEMICONDUCTOR CIRCUIT)	
COMPRISING SEMICONDUCTOR)	
ELEMENT, AND METHOD FOR)	
MANUFACTURING THE SAME)	

RESPONSE

Honorable Commissioner of Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

The Official Action mailed March 1, 2004, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for One Month Extension of Time*, which extends the shortened statutory period for response to July 1, 2004. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicants note with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on July 28, 1999, February 11, 2002, February 15, 2002, and November 25, 2002. However, the Applicants have not received acknowledgment of the IDS filed January 14, 2004. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide an initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 evidencing consideration of the IDS filed January 14, 2004.

Claims 45-50, 52-54, 56-58, 60-62, 64, 65, and 67-72 are pending in the present application, of which claims 45, 49, 52, 56, 60, and 64 are independent.

The Official Action rejects claims 45, 47, 60, 62 and 67-72 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,858,819 to Miyasaka and U.S. Patent No. 5,851,860 Makita et al. Also, the Official Action rejects claims 46, 49-50, 52-54, 56-58, 61, 64 and 65 as obvious based on the combination of Miyasaka, Makita and further U.S. Patent No. 6,066,516 to Miyasaka.

The Applicants gratefully acknowledge the telephone interview granted by Examiner Ghyka on June 25, 2004. It was understood that the Official Action mailed March 1, 2004 did not take into consideration the *Rule 132 Declaration* filed November 25, 2003 (unexecuted copy) and January 14, 2004 (executed copy). It was further understood that the Examiner would consider the *Rule 132 Declaration* and the corresponding arguments in the *Amendment* filed November 25, 2003, particularly at pages 10-12, and that the Examiner would issue a further non-final Official Action, taking these matters into consideration.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric J. Robinson Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C. PMB 955 21010 Southbank Street Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165 (571) 434-6789